DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 419 JC 690 191

By-Bunnell, Kevin P., Ed.; Vadala, Julia, Ed.

Effective State Board Leadership in Community College Development, Papers of a Workshop (San Francisco, September 26-27, 1968).

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colo.
Pub Date Feb 69
Note-43p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.25
Descriptors-*Board of Education Role, *Boards of Education, *Governing Boards, *Junior Colleges, Workshops
Identifiers-Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

A workshop sponsored by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education was attended by members and staffs of state boards for community colleges and by interested representatives from states without such boards. More than 75 people represented 13 states. Its purpose was to broaden the participants' understanding of the issues of community colleges and to learn how various states have coped with their rapid growth. This report contains summaries of speeches by six consultants: (1) "Community College Systems Across the Nation," by Leland Medsker; (2) "The Community College in the American Educational System," by Thomas Shay. (3) "A Joint Presentation on Distribution of Responsibility Between State and Local Community College Boards," by Dale Tillery and Leland Medsker; (4) "Budgeting and Financing for State System Colleges. Some Trends and Guidelines," by Paul Elsner; (5) "Considerations in Building a Community College System--the 'If,' 'When,' 'Where,' and 'What' of Developing Community Colleges," by Frederick Giles; and (6) "New Models for Planning Community Colleges," by John E. Roueche. A roster of the participants is included. (HH)

ED030419

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EFFECTIVE STATE BOARD LEADERSHIP
in
COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT

The papers of a Workshop held
in San Francisco, California
September 26-27, 1968

Edited by
Kevin P. Bunnell
and
Julia Vadala

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
University East Campus Boulder, Colorado 80302

February, 1969

JC690191

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 27 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

FOREWORD

The number of community colleges in the West has increased dramatically in the past few years. Many states have responded to this growth by providing statewide coordination for these colleges. Because of the trend toward coordination at the state level, WICHE felt it appropriate to sponsor a workshop to examine some of the major considerations in developing community college systems and statewide coordinating agencies.

The workshop was held September 26 and 27, 1968, in San Francisco. Participants included members and staffs of state boards for community colleges, as well as representatives from states without such boards who were concerned about statewide community college development.

The workshop theme, "Effective State Board Leadership in Community College Development," attempted to broaden the participants' understanding of community college issues and to explain how various states have coped with the rapid growth of such colleges.

The report of the workshop consists of summaries of speeches by six consultants: Dr. Paul Elsner, *Director of the Division of Community Colleges, Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education;* Dr. Frederick Giles, *Dean of the College of Education, University of Washington;* Dr. Leland Medsker, *Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley;* Dr. John Roueche, *Director, Community College Division of the Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia, Durham, North Carolina;* Dr. Thomas Shay, *Associate Professor of Higher Education and Director, Community College Leadership Program, University of Colorado;* and Dr. Dale Tillery, *Project Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Professor of Higher Education, University of California.*

Over 75 participants representing all 13 western states attended the workshop. This wide base of interest is evidence that these people are seeking new ways to improve their leadership roles in the West's community college systems. Through the meeting, WICHE provided a vehicle for these leaders to discuss

states' common educational problems and seek solutions for them.

The papers in this publication should contribute to a greater understanding of the role of statewide community college boards as they relate, not only to local community colleges, but also to the entire state educational structure.

Kevin P. Bunnell
Associate Director
Western Interstate Commission
for Higher Education

Boulder, Colorado 80302
February, 1969

CONTENTS

Community College Systems Across the Nation 1
Dr. Leland Medsker

The Community College in the American Educational System 5
Dr. Thomas Shay

A Joint Presentation on Distribution of Responsibility between State and Local Community College Boards

I. *Dr. Dale Tillery*.....11

II. *Dr. Leland Medsker*.....15

Considerations in Building a Community College System -- the "If," "When," "Where," and "What" of Developing Community Colleges.....21
Dr. Frederick Giles

Budgeting and Financing for State System Colleges: Some Trends and Guidelines.....27
Dr. Paul Elsner

New Models for Planning Community Colleges.....33
Dr. John E. Roueche

Roster of Workshop Participants.....39

COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEMS ACROSS THE NATION

Leland Medsker
Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
University of California at Berkeley

Historically, community colleges emerged from systems of secondary education. Because of this, most were initially under the control of state boards of education. Thus, in most states these boards retained policy-making authority for community colleges as well as for elementary and secondary education. Later, as community colleges increased in number, many states established separate agencies to coordinate their development.

Educators and state policy makers have encouraged this trend because they realize that this growing segment of education demands special, systematic coordination. For this reason, many states have set up community college systems with two kinds of coordination responsibilities: (1) coordination among the community colleges within the system; and (2) coordination of the two-year schools with other segments of the state's total educational program. The already over-burdened state boards of education in most states, unable to cope effectively with such coordinative responsibilities, have given over this responsibility to separate state agencies for community colleges.

State-wide community college systems share several common characteristics. One characteristic is that there are enough colleges and enough community college program offerings to warrant state-wide coordination. A large number of schools and a variety of programs insure the status of community colleges as an important segment of education in these states. One sure sign that community colleges have been recognized as an essential part of the state's array of educational institutions is if they are included in a state master plan for education.

Another important characteristic of a state community college system is the cohesion that a coordinated system brings to the separate colleges. Through a system they are able to act as partners as they relate to other levels of education in the state.

Historical Review of Community College Development

Although community college systems do have several common characteristics, there have been many variations in the systems over the past 50 years.

The first of what may be called community college systems was actually an extension of secondary education. A public community college in Joliet, Illinois, was the first of such "colleges" in the country, and its programs were merely attached to the high school and the public school system.

Another major variation was the so-called "6-4-4 Plan" developed during the 1920's and 1930's. This plan created a 6-year elementary program; a 4-year intermediate high school (which included grades 7-10); and an upper 4-year unit consisting of grades 11-14. California had several such organizational structures, as did many middle western states.

Also during the 1920's, another pattern evolved which created separate local districts and boards of control for community colleges. A unique feature of this plan was the district's taxing power to maintain the two-year schools. This pattern of locally-supported and controlled community colleges is used in most states today. Few community colleges still are attached to local public school systems.

Regardless of the organizational pattern, there always has been some state level agency responsible for community colleges. Thus, because these institutions originally were parts of the public school system, the state agency responsible became the state board of education.

Variation in Present Community College Systems

Three emerging patterns for two-year college coordination are modifying the traditional role of state boards of education.

1. *Local Control and State Coordination.* The predominant pattern for community college organization is local control and support with state level coordination. States such as Arizona, California, Oregon, Washington, and several middle western states have been in this category. The state coordination agency is usually one of the following:

   (a) A state board of education;
   (b) A separate state-level coordinating board for community colleges;

(c) A commission or some overall state board responsible for all higher education;

2. State Support and Control. A second system for coordinating community colleges provides total state support. This exists in a state system of community colleges which are neither locally-controlled nor university-affiliated. Colorado recently started such a system where the prime responsibility is vested in a state-level board for community colleges and vocational education.* Minnesota and Massachusetts are other examples.

3. University Control. A third pattern is the university-related system. The community colleges in this system are controlled by university policy and are often referred to as other campuses of the university. In the West, Alaska and Hawaii are two states with such a system.

There appears to be one major thread linking the various movements toward systems for community colleges. That thread is the trend toward coordination of the educational components within each state. The other contributors to this publication will discuss in depth the trend toward coordinationa and its implications on the division of responsibility between the state and local community college agencies. This outline, however, has attempted to set the stage for understanding the flexibility which gives great latitude to those persons charged with allocating responsibility for coordinating community college development.

* Community college participation in the Colorado state system is voluntary.

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Thomas M. Shay
Associate Professor of Higher Education
Director, Community College Leadership Program
University of Colorado

If community colleges are to fulfill their unique mission within the framework of American education, they must, it seems, pay careful attention to the development of four characteristics.

Accessibility

First, the community college should be accessible to all its potential students -- accessible economically, geographically, academically and psychologically.

Comprehensiveness

Second, the community college should be comprehensive, offering a wide variety of courses and services, with a strong emphasis on technical and developmental work. It should also be internally articulated. That is, it should be so structured that a student is not bound to a particular track and major, nor is he bound to a particular level of employment. Instead, the student is encouraged and helped to move from one level and area of study to another as he learns more about himself and his potential.

Flexibility

Third, the community college programs should be flexible and responsive to a local community, although alert to national and international trends and affairs. The community college should be innovative.

Quality

Fourth, the community college must offer a high quality of work in all its curricula regardless of type or level.

Community College as It Relates to Other Segments of Education

Is the community college most appropriately a part of higher education, or a part of secondary education? I define it as a part of higher education because most, though not all, of its offerings assume that the student has completed high school level studies and because most of its students are of post-high school age. (I hasten to add, however, that the community college has learned much from good secondary teaching practices, and can continue to learn.) I am also convinced that the community college should be administratively separate from secondary schools and from other elements of higher education. It must have its own identify.

As an element of higher education, the community college should strive to make available, to all members of the community, all aspects of post-secondary, but less than baccalaureate education which are not otherwise adequately supplied. Now, some are certain to raise the question: "Can this community college be all things to all men?" I am reasonably sure it cannot, but I am also reasonbly sure that it can be more things to more men than can any other existing institution or organization of education.

The relationship of the community college to the secondary schools should be one in which the community college offers educational opportunity for <u>all</u> high school graduates, as well as others in the community. These opportunities must be known and accessible to all high school graduates. The community college can, and should, have a closer relationship with the high schools than do any of the other kinds of institutions of higher education.

Occupational and Adult Education

A commonly expressed concern is the appropriate curricular relationship of the community college to the high schools, the vocational-technical centers, and adult education centers. It is not necessary for any particular community college to take over a specific list of functions <u>if</u> these functions are now adequately served by the secondary schools. For example, in many communities around the country, the secondary system has a strong adult education program operated in high schools in the evenings. However, it may well be a long-run advantage to the community if there is a gradual shift of many special functions, such as adult education, from the secondary schools to the community colleges.

I have two basic reasons for making this proposition. One is that a well-organized and well-run community college probably

can offer a greater variety of opportunities to persons in adult education than can adult education programs in secondary schools. Second, by moving certain functions such as adult education from the secondary setting to the community college setting, it may be possible to release major amounts of secondary school funds for the improvement of other secondary programs.

A special comment is in order concerning the vocational-technical centers. Regardless of the institutional setting of these centers, it seems to me to be absolutely imperative that the education and training offered be available to all interested and qualified persons regardless of age. Only about half of our high school graduates enter any kind of college, and about one-third of those students who enter high school do not graduate. These persons constitute a very large and important segment of our society. They deserve and need to be trained and educated to become personally, socially, and economically productive members of society. This certainly means that a variety of sound occupational training opportunities must continue to be available at the high school level.

In many large communities, it may be organizationally and economically feasible to offer one rather complete set of occupational programs in the high schools and another different, but equally complete set in the community colleges. In smaller communities, it often seems unwise to duplicate facilities. When this is the case, these facilities should be part of the community college, but accessible to high school students as well as to those of college age and above.

Regardless of what occupational training opportunities are available in the high schools, there must be comprehensive education in the community college, ranging from six-week programs for low-skill jobs to two-year programs in sophisticated technologies. We are in an era when the demand for trained workers and educated citizens is rapidly increasing, and when large numbers of mature workers require frequent occupational upgrading and retraining.

Other Elements of Higher Education

What should be the relationship of the community college to other elements of higher education? The following remarks are premised upon the concept of differentiated roles and functions of various kinds of higher educational institutions, with the community colleges characterized as noted earlier. Of those characteristics, I believe that true comprehensiveness, in both kind and level of programs, is the characteristic which most clearly distinguishes the community college from other elements of higher education.

Probably the next most important characteristic is the open door policy. One of the most commonly debated questions in the area of community college relationships has to do with the matter of differential admissions standards to the three elements of public higher education. I am inclined to favor some differentiation, with the community college always maintaining an open door policy. Among other advantages, such a policy maintains for all students the possibility of transferring to a more selective institution once he has proven himself in a less selective institution.

The discussion of differentiated institutional functions in higher education almost inevitably leads to the question: "Should the four-year institutions give up their lower divisions altogether and turn them over to the community colleges?" I do not think we know enough about such a plan of operation to give any categorical answer to the question, although it is being tried in Florida and in Illinois and has been tried to a certain extent in other states. My own feeling is that it is not wise for all four-year institutions to give up their lower division programs. It seems to me that we have ample evidence from the work of the Berkeley Center for Research and Development in Higher Education that there is a great variety of students with an equally great variety of interests and needs. If we are to meet these interests and needs, we must have also a variety of institutions of higher education. The problem is to get the right students into the right institutions.

States ought to be prepared to spend a great deal of thought, energy, and money on the student personnel programs in community colleges. If these colleges are, in fact, the colleges with the closest relationships with the local high school, it follows that the community colleges will have the greatest amount of contact with the high school students. High school counselors have a very large job to do in helping students meet the problems of adolescence and broad post-high school career decisions. Community college counselors and other student personnel persons can assist in the advising function by becoming experts concerning the initial choice of post-secondary institutions.

Articulation between Community Colleges and Four-Year Institutions

Articulation and acceptance of course work and student transfers between community colleges and four-year institutions requires cooperation and involvement of all institutions in a state. Community colleges should be regarded as mature educational organizations with ample intelligence sources to determine the needs of their own students. There is no reason why a student who has met the general education requirements at a community college

should not also be considered to have met the lower division general education requirements at a state college or university.

But agreement on these and other matters of articulation cannot be reached unilaterally, nor can it be effectively applied by administrative fiat. It requires involvement of all a state's institutions, and of large numbers of persons in those institutions. All too often we regard articulation as if it were an abstraction, which it is not. The process of articulation is one which involves the feelings, careers, time, money, and energy of individuals, both students and teachers as well as the resources of institutions and states.

Articulation is not simply a matter of the clerical evaluation or transcription of course titles or credit hours. Real articulation of course work and of student transfers is not possible without the face to face confrontation of faculties. This means that there is a real necessity for frequent articulation conferences at which small groups of faculty and administrators have an opportunity to ask questions, to exchange ideas, and to engage in debate over the virtues of various approaches. A common failing of articulation conferences is that the university or the state college people assume that they are the leaders and that they necessarily know more about lower division instruction than do the teachers in the community college.

There should be very close interaction among the faculties and administrators of all elements of higher education. It is not enough for presidents, deans, and registrars to meet occasionally, necessary as such meetings are. Faculties must meet, must visit one another's campuses and become real colleagues. If there is real understanding among these educators, there will be much better possibilities for mutual acceptance.

Relationship of Community Colleges and Graduate Institutions

Special mention should be made of two other aspects of the relationships with other institutions of higher education. One is that the graduate institutions have an obligation to prepare personnel for work in the community colleges. Many state colleges and universities in the WICHE region do have such programs. But the demand is large, and there is need for continued development of such programs. It is imperative that graduate programs for community college personnel be developed with the continuing advice, assistance, and evaluation of the community colleges, so that the persons who complete the programs are specifically prepared for community college work.

A second important joint function of community colleges and

graduate institutions is that of community college research. Many community colleges are developing good institutional research programs and most important operational research is conducted through state offices. Nevertheless, the need is usually greater than institutions and state offices are able to meet with their own staffs. The graduate institutions may be able to provide personnel and know-how to carry out additional research services.

Cooperative Use of Faculties and Facilities

We should also note the possibilities for cooperative use of faculties and facilities. An obvious example of this cooperation is the use of community college faculties and rooms for the offering of university extension work. This is a fairly common practice. Probably even more common is the community colleges' use of secondary faculty and rooms in offering evening work. Some university departments have suggested faculty exchanges with community colleges. Another department has suggested the development of mobile laboratory units which could be used for instruction in both the university and the community colleges. We should give careful attention and encouragement to these and other cooperative ventures.

These then, are some of the things which are important about the relationships of the community college with other elements of education. But they are by no means prescriptions. Each state has its own population patterns, its own problems of finance, its own educational history. In developing community colleges, none of these factors may be ignored, nor may a host of others. Nevertheless, in any state the community college individually or as a system must be based upon the needs, recognized or unrecognized, of the people and their communities. To determine community college roles and relationships, we must ask and answer some hard questions. What are their levels of training and education of the people? What are their levels of aspiration? What are the business and industrial needs of the state? What are the cultural needs of the state? What opportunities are presently available to the citizens of the state? What agencies and institutions are offering what programs, and to whom?

The next broad question is: Which of the needed opportunities for the citizens can best be offered by the community college? And, finally, the question: How can the total educational system and the individual schools and colleges best be organized to provide these opportunities?

If we really have answers to questions like these, we have a reasonable chance of working out community college roles and relationships according to a rational plan, rather than by default, by chance, or under the pressure of special interest groups.

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSIBILITY BETWEEN STATE AND LOCAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARDS

Dale Tillery
Project Director
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
Professor of Higher Education
University of California

Several considerations about community college education influence the distribution of administrative and policy-making authority between state and local boards. One is the responsiveness of the community college to the needs of the local community. Another consideration is the need to conserve scarce resources. A third is the level of local development and public opinion which affect community college education.

Response and Relevance to Students and Community

The community college must provide relevant educational services to its students and to its community. Any division of authority between state and local boards must reflect this commitment. Leaders at both levels have challenging roles to guide the junior college to meet the profound educational changes demanded by students and society. Because of its unique position in higher education, the junior college can meet these demands.

The junior college is a new institution; it is a new model of education. For these reasons, its flexibility should enable it to be innovative and responsive to the student and community needs. The junior college must build on the strengths that are available from other educational models. But it also must build new programs of education, new ways of planning curriculum, new ways of teaching, new forms of guidance. In a sense, they must try to find out what their new and unique role is. State and local resources must be coordinated to bring success to this role.

Conservation of Scarce Resources

Among the material resources essential for community college development and coordination are money and personnel, both of which are scarce. This dilemma of scarce resources is an important factor affecting community college administration and development. Regardless of how powers are delineated, both state and local boards must accept the responsibility to conserve human

and fiscal resources.

Many have charged that the California community colleges developed as dramatically as they have because they pirated faculties and leadership from the rest of the nation. If community colleges develop as rapidly in other states as they have in California, who is going to pirate from whom? Where is higher education going to get qualified faculty to man the impressive number of existing and developing institutions? The answer to the latter question may influence the distribution of responsibilities between state and local boards for community colleges.

Local Development and State Involvement

Forces influencing the distribution of community college authority vary from state to state and from community to community. The forces which determine the relationship between state and local agencies are a function of the level of community college development both locally and in the institution. The levels vary dramatically, depending on such factors as educational expertness, public opinion and financial resources. Each of the several stages of local development place different challenges upon state agencies to fill developmental gaps.

Public Opinion and Community College Development

Public opinion determines how rapidly a given community college system will develop. Opinion makers not only include community citizens and tax payers, but also legislators and educators. Effective development of the community colleges depends on the readiness of these groups to accept and enhance the community college. These attitudes also have direct bearing upon the degree of centralization or coordination among the community college efforts.

California enjoys a favorable climate for coordination because for fifty years universities and state colleges have included the junior colleges as an essential part of higher education. This practice not only has been a service to students, but also has strengthened the development of the senior institutions. In other states, however, there are still great reservations and hostilities to the inroads of community college education on the apparent prerogatives of senior institutions. Clearly, such attitudes toward community colleges negatively influences the willingness of such states to mobilize resources for community college development.

Organizational Structures for Community College Coordination

Organizational structures for community college development and coordination must be flexible. They must be able to adapt to the many forces cited above which influence community college development.

In some states, community college coordination may reflect a trend toward increased gathering of power and authority within a centralized agency. In others, state coordination boards may relinquish authority to local boards which have accumulated substantial human resources and physical facilities and have demonstrated their ability to assume greater responsibility.

The idea that community college coordinating organizations are not static is important to remember. A corollary of this appears in two major trends which touch almost every facet of our social and political lives. One is the trend toward greater centralization and coordination. We see it equally in education and government. A counter trend is toward decentralized public participation in decision making, particularly in those decisions which affect the welfare and needs of the public. In education, the most vocal groups are students, faculty, and community and business leaders who want to insure that education is relevant to their needs.

Maybe these two trends are on collision courses. But there is an alternative to collision. This is true especially in the separate roles of state vs. local community college boards. The alternative is an effort by both boards to understand the educational concerns of the other. With this kind of accommodation, it is possible to coordinate and build junior colleges and effective community college systems.

To do this, the central agencies or state coordinating boards for community colleges must begin to think in human terms. For instance, they must not consider enrollments in a state system only in terms of dollars and square feet. They must realize that enrollments represent people.

The decisions a state board must make are, indeed, human decisions because they determine who will be educated and who will not. The board's interactions with students, faculty and local boards will increase its sensitivity to the human aspects of education. There must be a similar effort at the local level to be sensitive to state board concerns, such as resources. In this regard, local level boards, students, and faculty must attempt to conserve and make maximum use of state and local resources.

Control of community colleges must not interfere with the need to design rational and effective programs and budgets for the allocation of resources. Careful planning must exist for the effective education of our citizenry.

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSIBILITY BETWEEN STATE AND LOCAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARDS

Leland Medsker
Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
University of California at Berkeley

The problem of distributing power between state and local agencies is not peculiar to community colleges. It is a problem of centralization versus decentralization which pervades many facets of today's educational, civic, and political life.

Educational Centralization Versus Decentralization

The issue of centralization versus decentralization arises between local community college campuses and state offices, between individual state colleges and boards of trustees, and in multi-campus university systems as well.

The current thrust among community colleges is toward maximum control at the local level, with a minimum control by state-level agencies. This thrust is partly a result of faculty and student demands for involvement in institutional decision-making. They feel that educational control at the local level can insure not only the flexibility in the community college program, but also relevancy of the institution to daily life. However, this trend toward local educational control currently is being modified by the complexity of the total state educational enterprise which demands coordination at a higher-than-local level.

In the past decade, most states have established some kind of overall state-wide coordinating agency for higher education. The federal government is endorsing the movement toward coordination by allocating funds to support studies to determine the plans for higher education in the future. These initiatives indicate movements which conflict with efforts to decentralize. There must be some accommodation by both the local community colleges and the state educational agencies to reconcile their differences concerning centralization versus decentralization.

Guidelines for Allocating Responsibilities

Dr. Ernest Palola recently completed a study for the Berkeley Center for Research and Development in Higher Education on the impact of statewide planning on institutional autonomy at the local level. The study focused on community colleges as well as four-year institutions in the states of Illinois, New York, California, and Florida. Dr. Palola concluded from his research that problems of statewide planning relate to the distribution of authority and influence between state and community college boards. To alleviate these many statewide planning problems, from his study, we may suggest that the distribution of responsibility must reflect the following:

(1) A concern for the goals of the individual institution. State and local level personnel concerned about community colleges must evaluate these goals periodically.

(2) An integration of effort among the community colleges.

(3) A concern about adequate monetary allocations for research among community colleges and among the programs within them.

(4) A concern whether these institutions have the opportunity to become innovative to meet the new needs of higher education.

(5) A mechanism for the community colleges to adapt to the environment and to respond to it.

This list should provide some useful guidelines for state board members attempting to allocate community college responsibilities.

The Nature of Responsibilities Concerning Community Colleges

Decisions to allocate responsibilities either to state or local community college boards should hinge on a clear understanding of the nature of these responsibilities. In 1965, the Berkeley Center did a study for the California Coordinating Council on the nature of these responsibilities in two categories: those relating to service; and those relating to the power structure or the legal status of the system.

Researchers on the project questioned community college instructional and administrative staff members about these responsibilities. There was a wide difference of opinion as to the extent to which they they thought state boards should be involved in these issues. In general, however, community college personnel concluded that state boards appropriately could be active in such

matters as coordination and long-term planning and the setting up of district boundaries. The state level should also have the authority to set standards for admitting and graduating junior college students. But the specifics of the academic curriculum, the school calendar, and staffing patterns were thought to be the prerogative of the institution. Also, they clearly felt that each institution should establish its own retention and probation standards for academic programs within that institution.

The following is a list of some of the major responsibilities identified by the study which must be allocated to either state or local community college boards:

Responsibilities of a Service Nature. The study identified two areas of responsibility of a service nature which should be distributed between state and local boards:

(1) Research and Long-Range Planning for Community Colleges. This includes the distribution of responsibility for educational media, faculty design, curriculum innovation, administrative structure, and plan utilization.

(2) Coordinating Machinery. This includes responsibility for decisions about academic calendars, appropriate spokesmen for junior colleges, information centers for junior colleges.

Responsibilities of a Legal Nature. The study also identified several areas of responsibility of a legal nature which should be divided between state and local community college boards. These areas are listed below:

(1) Community College Curricula. This includes decisions about the curricula content in local colleges and regional assignments of vocational curricula and instructional material.

(2) Educational Policies. These responsibilities included the following: setting minimum standards for the probation or suspension of junior colleges in a state and minimum standards for student admission and graduation.

(3) Organization and Facilities. The responsibilities in this area include administrative organization of individual institutions, the design and construction of campus facilities, and district formation and boundaries of districts.

(4) Financial Considerations. Responsibilities for the collection and allocating of financial resources must

be divided between the state and local level. Such financial considerations include student fees, institutional budgeting, equalization formulas, and accounting practices.

(5) Personnel Policies. The responsibility to set personnel policies must be divided between the state and local level. These policies include the authority to appoint, retain, or dismiss staff and to set salary levels.

Communications Essential for Coordination

No matter how the responsibilities are divided, there must be effective communications links between state and local agencies. Illinois has an effective communications system which might serve as a model for other states. In Illinois there is a council of community college presidents which meets monthly with the staff of the state board for community colleges. The council frequently makes formal presentations to the state board, as well as maintains close liaison with the Illinois Association of Community Colleges. Together, the state board and the representatives of the local colleges designed a legislative program for 1967 and coordinated it with the junior college association. The close liaison between the local and state-level educational agencies in Illinois is one example of a successful communications system.

Similar systems which encourage close liaison with the local and state level agencies are essential to coordinating state community college efforts.

It must be remembered that the state board for community colleges is part of a system of higher education in the state. Such a board must coordinate with numerous agencies in its efforts to provide effective community college education. Among these agencies are the state department of finance, the state legislature, as well as the community college association itself.

In states with strong local community college boards, there must be an increased effort to establish workable relationships with the state board of education. A vivid example is in vocational-technical education. In most states, the responsibility for this education is in the hands of the state department of education. For this reason, there must be continued liaison between the state department and the individual colleges offering vocational-technical education programs.

The decisions to distribute responsibilities for community colleges must reflect a mutual accommodation of interests between

state and local boards. The success of these decisions depends on constant communication between the two levels and continual evaluation of the power distribution.

CONSIDERATIONS IN BUILDING A COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM
THE "IF," "WHEN," "WHERE," AND "WHAT" OF DEVELOPING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Frederick T. Giles
Dean of the College of Education
University of Washington

"Things ain't what they used to be, and probably never were." A statement attributed to Mark Twain, could have been written about community colleges.

A changing pattern has characterized the community college scene starting with the first junior college nearly a hundred years ago. The first junior college actually was only an extension of secondary education. Prior to 1950 there were several attempts to develop a system of post-high school two-year colleges. But like many good ideas, these attempts seemed to be ahead of their time.

It was not until the latter half of the 1950's that an increasing public demand for higher education opportunities prompted changes in state educational policies. The result was the effort to make community college education available to all people within a state.

Considerations in Developing a Community College System

Once a state starts considering community college education, the system that develops depends upon the answers to such questions as:

> What assumptions about, or objectives for, post-high school education have been accepted in the state? Is it to be accessible to all, or accessible to certain geographic, economic, academic and age groups?
>
> What planning has been done to implement the assumptions or objectives? Does the planning include all post-high school education or just certain segments or types?
>
> What are the expectations for the system? Is the purpose to make for more effective education, to reduce the costs of education, to reduce the number

of institutions, or to slow down the development?

What are the constraints which must be considered in developing the system? Most systems result from what is acceptable within the state to the constitution, to legislation, to methods of finance, and to existing colleges and universities.

What kind of accountability is desired and necessary to insure the attainment of objectives?

How much initiative for providing leadership is expected at the various levels of the system?

What kind of organization will provide for continuous, systematic feedback and evaluation for improvement of the system?

The answers to these questions have provided the basis for developing the variety of systems for community colleges in existence today. These systems range from complete local control to complete state control, with various combinations of local and state control. Perhaps they can be classified best as local control, local control with state coordination, university control, state control, state system with shared control.

Local Control of Community Colleges. Local community control can provide only for a voluntary system of community college education. Each institution must voluntarily give up or loan some of its authority if any coordination takes place. The basic assumptions behind this type of control are: (1) Community college education is developed only where people want it, deserve it, and are willing to finance it; (2) It is a local concern and not a state concern; (3) Local control is frequently the first stage of a system of development and will continue as more colleges are established.

State Coordination of Community Colleges. Local control usually develops into a second stage: a state-coordinated system. Control frequently stays local, but the furtherance of a master plan for development becomes of concern to the state. A state agency usually assumed concern for new programs and for maintaining excellence of programs. The state agency establishes guidelines and criteria for initiating and developing new colleges. A state-coordinated system emerges when states assume the objective of providing community college education within commuting distance of a majority of high school graduates.

University Control of Community Colleges. A third system is one controlled by a four-year college or university. This is basically carried out through establishing extension centers to offer educational programs to a broader geographical area. The "if," "when," "where," and "what of developing community colleges are determined by the university objectives.

State Control of Community Colleges. A fourth type is the state-controlled and operated system. Some states have thought it best to reduce local control and place authority for control and operation in a state agency. The state agency would then determine the answers to questions regarding the development of community college education.

State System with Shared Local Control of Community Colleges. Recently there has emerged a trend toward a statewide system coordinating local districts. Its objective is to provide opportunity for two years of college and continuing education to all the people of the state in the most effective and efficient manner. This system requires a master plan at the state level which reflects projected plans for development in the local districts. The state agency is responsible for providing coordination and leadership to the local districts which have the responsibility for programming.

States involved in public community college development have tried many of these five systems. States entering programs of community college development choose a type based on their philosophy of post-high school education and existing higher education developments.

The essential point is that there is not a common state plan for community college development in the fifty states. Any one plan can evolve into a more systematic program under certain circumstances.

Foundation in Building a System of Community Colleges

The foundation of effective community college education is a systematic development of the institutions. A state is ready for the development of a community college system when it is concerned enough to :

> Provide a basic system of comprehensive two-year colleges.
>
> Insure that every area of the state is considered in the planning.

Provide planning for tomorrow's needs as well as operating to fulfill present requirements.

Insure every person equal opportunity to benefit from the educational program.

Provide for equalized financial resources.

Provide for accountability rather than control.

Once a state has made the above commitments, it should be able to provide two-year higher education opportunities for all its people.

The basic considerations in a forward-looking community college system would include:

A firmly-stated conviction that it is in the public interest that accessibility to education beyond the high school be afforded to all, to the limit of their ability to benefit from it, thus resulting in social gain.

A complete systematic development of community colleges for the entire state.

A system which eventually provides for all areas and for all the population of the state.

A state regulatory agency responsible for an orderly development and for the excellence of programs.

A means by which the total area of the state is divided into local districts for operating colleges.

Local districts with their own governing boards responsible for operating existing colleges and planning for continued development to meet the needs of the district.

District boundaries which conform as closely as possible to the natural areas from which students will come.

A guaranteed level of support for operation with a method for providing additional support if desired.

A method of long-range support for capital construction in order that planning for the future can be done with assurance.

A guarantee that the direct cost to the student will be kept at a minimum.

A flexibility of administration that encourages decentralization at the state level as well as at the multi-campus district level.

These considerations do not assure success of any community college system. But one test of an adequate organization is the amount of energy that is required to make it effective. Another test is whether it accomplishes the goals and objectives of the state regarding community college development.

The value of the system is the ability to provide for the outcomes that the state and society expect of the community college.

BUDGETING AND FINANCING FOR STATE SYSTEM COLLEGES: Some Trends and Guidelines

Paul A. Elsner
Director of the Division of Community Colleges
Colorado State Board for Community Colleges
and Occupational Education

As we approach the end of this decade and move into the seventies, we can see some significant signs affecting the administration and governance of community colleges. Future writers in the junior college field may look back on the sixties as a "golden era" of community college growth.

It seems more than accidental that this "golden era" also saw considerable local initiative for the establishment of community colleges. The sixties marked a time when local communities translated educational opportunity into a means of obtaining local economic growth. Virtually every community of any size had a citizens' committee whose sole crusade was to establish a local junior college.

Armed with feasibility studies and enrollment statistics, local interest groups set in motion the creation of a community college. Such initiation often brought the local community college into existence under the banner of civic pride, educational opportunity for all, and under the assumption that the local tax bill could support one more major enterprise.

Trend Toward State Fiscal Support

These initiatives still provide support for junior college development. But several new trends are affecting local interest.

The first trend is that local citizens appear willing to shift local support for most public services to larger, more embracing taxing jurisdictions. One such public service is the public community college.

Secondly, it appears easier to finance the initial development of a junior college than to provide adequate ongoing tax support for programs. Those communities that have had significant demographic change experience considerable frustration in getting local financial support. Particularly in communities with a large number of older people, it is difficult to obtain

support for junior colleges.

While the shift to state levels for larger financial support appears evident, local junior colleges reluctantly relinquish certain controls that go with fiscal responsibility. The central issue in all state systems of junior colleges is finding an appropriate balance between state coordination and local initiative. The pattern toward increased state support necessarily poses a threat to local initiative, which, in the view of many thoughtful people, can and will thwart the most basic component of a strong junior college.

The major challenges state boards of community colleges face in view of these general trends toward the shifting to greater state support are clear. One challenge is that state boards will be pressed to develop new governance models that preserve and maintain local initiative.

A second is that great pressures will be placed on the state board leadership to vie effectively for the allocation of scarce state resources to support junior colleges. Currently, this pressure constitutes one of our most critical dilemmas. State level community college boards generally have not been equipped to cope in the legislative arena for effective financial support. Too often junior college interests merely have been added to coordinating bodies. Junior college boards must become integrated parts of the decision-making processes which affect support levels for higher education. They cannot continue to be additions to the existing structure.

For these reasons, it is imperative that state boards for community colleges be knowledgeable about budgeting and financing. Board members and staffs should consider the following points:

Integrated Systems of Higher Education

First, state boards must recognize that higher education constitutes a total system and that junior college interests cannot stand as a separate entity. In states such as New York, Illinois, and California, there is comparatively great strength in the junior colleges because these states operate with integrated systems of higher education. If junior college boards are to receive adequate financial support, they must become visible and sometimes vocal partners of commissions on higher education or coordinating bodies.

Educational Long-Range Planning and Budgeting

Budgeting or financing systems must be integrally tied to certain assumptions about basic planning. Both educators and legislators must agree on answers to the following basic questions before they consider long-range planning:

> What are the respective roles of the university, the state colleges, the extension centers and the junior colleges in meeting the total higher education needs in your state?
>
> What effects shall varying degrees of selective admissions policies have on the various sectors of higher education, most particularly the public junior colleges?
>
> What are the patterns of curriculum that each institution ultimately expects to achieve over a five-year or a ten-year period?

In brief, each sector of higher education must define its specific long-range missions. Resources to accomplish these missions must be projected in dollar costs. The Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education now is undertaking such planning. The Board has set as the goal for each community college in the state system that enrollment ought to balance out with approximately half of the head count in occupationally-oriented programs. The budgeting implications of such a planning policy are significant. It must be remembered that initial outlays have a dramatic effect on current operational budgets. It is important not to sell vocational-technical programs to legislators on a lower initial cost basis.

Budgeting to Provide Educational Opportunity for Entire Population

In another major policy decision, the Colorado State Board has stated explicitly that junior colleges shall meet the needs of clientele altogether new to higher education. Colorado junior colleges have generated opportunity for those who heretofore have not taken advantage of post-high school education.

Our research indicates that junior colleges in Colorado have not had adequate representation from all segments of the state's population. But, for the sake of example, let's say if

the junior colleges' mission is to serve 1.25% of the state's population in ten years, the budgetary implications can then be extrapolated for the legislature. Colorado junior college full-time equivalent (FTE) students currently comprise 16.3% of the total number of students in higher education. This has increased at about 2 1/2% a year. The goal for Colorado junior college enrollment in 10 years is 30% of the total FTE students in institutions of higher education. The Board is working with the Commission for Higher Education to project accurate budgetary requirements for these goals.

Effective Program Building and Budgeting

Budgeting must relate to program and function. In this connection, Colorado has divided the state into major occupational planning areas. This permits the staff to allocate costly occupational programs on some kind of a statewide scheme. In some instances we have been able to use standard metropolitan statistical bases as a starting point for projecting manpower needs. More importantly, however, it permits some structure for the development of occupational curriculum under a rational plan. Unfortunately, there is so much to be done in occupational education that we are not immediately threatened by proliferation and duplication of scarce resources.

Educational Budgetary Requests and Comparable Data

Long-range goals should be reflected in year-to-year budgetary requests. There is a greater acceptance from the various fiscal agencies when a board can project a five-year plan that says, "This is where we want to be five years from now." Budget policies affecting such long-range decisions must be based on data gathering and research. With extensive research, however, there is a danger of over-formulization in setting either minimal or maximum standards for operational costs or capital outlay.

An appropriate guideline for state boards to follow in budget building is to use comparable data. It seems far easier to defend or sometimes reject a budgetary request if comparable institutional data are at your fingertips. Moreover, the institutions must participate as partners in your overall research and data program.

It is important that key college personnel be brought in to help design the broad statewide institutional research program. No budget office can function without a full-range institutional research program. Data collection at the state level requires full and competent staff. The state board gets its investment

back ten-fold if its budgeting functions at the state level are supported by a coordinator or director of research.

In Colorado we developed a statewide system of accounting, reporting, and budgeting procedures, consisting of representatives from both local and state system business officials, representatives of the Commission on Higher Education, the Controller's office, the Legislative Audit Committee. The Board, in turn, appointed a local business manager as chairman and contracted a consulting firm to assist in the development of a uniform system of accounting and budgeting. In short, many of the fears and restraints about working within a state-wide framework of reporting and budgeting were alleviated.

Let me attempt to conclude by summarizing the points raised in this paper.

First, local support appears to be shifting from local *ad valorem* taxation to state-level financing.

Second, this shift of support calls for a delicate balance between local initiative and the providing for basic local prerogatives and statewide coordination.

Third, rigid control, usually in the form of fiscal restraints, can destroy the important components of a dynamic, working local institution, particularly if such controls thwart initiative, local identity.

Fourth, state governing bodies must participate in the larger partnerships; namely, those agencies involved in coordination. State boards cannot afford to isolate themselves if they are to achieve political and financial stability.

These more specific guidelines were suggested:

1. Junior college long-range goals must be part of the total state system of higher education.

2. Budgeting and finance programs must be tied to specific planning assumptions. These planning assumptions can become realistic objectives if they are within an integrated and acceptable plan, endorsed by parent bodies,

and, ultimately, the legislature.

3. Basic policy decisions must be defined in terms of related functions.

4. Budgeting must be tied to program and other related functions.

5. Sound budgeting systems must relate resources to both short and long-range missions.

6. In the process of allocating resources to institutions, there is a danger of over-formulizing statewide spending practices. Wider local participation in setting minimal and maximum standards reduces this danger, especially if comparative data can be generated.

7. Sound budget administration must be supported by a fully-developed research and data gathering program. Ideally, local college personnel should be involved to participate and even design such data gathering systems.

Hopefully, these observations about the experiences of the Colorado State Board for Community Colleges will be useful guidelines for other state boards wishing to establish effective budgeting procedures.

NEW MODELS FOR PLANNING COMMUNITY COLLEGES

John E. Roueche
Director, Community College Division
of the Regional Education Laboratory
for the Carolinas and Virginia
Durham, North Carolina

In a recent address before a large group of educators, a junior college spokesman proudly proclaimed, "The junior college movement is simply fantastic. New colleges are 'growing like Topsy.'" To "grow like Topsy" is hardly a proud accomplishment for a community college system in any state when local, state, and national planning are of such paramount importance.

The fact is that the junior college movement has grown rapidly. More than seventy new junior colleges opened their doors in 1967, and almost 200 more are in the process of being established. Estimated enrollments of junior colleges in the next five years will double, reaching a total of 3 million.[1] The considerable growth of public community colleges in the past decade necessitates statewide planning and coordination. Without such planning there would be inequities in educational opportunity and in the use of financial resources.

Often it has been assumed that the creation of a state system of community colleges automatically provides for statewide planning and coordination. This is not the case. Actually most states do not have any statewide plan that provides for the orderly establishment of and financial support for public two-year colleges.[2]

Problems created by the absence of a state plan have been documented by F.D. Gurll in illustrating the development of a master plan in California. Gurll stated that, in 1959, the numerous higher education bills introduced in the California Assembly threatened to destroy existing patterns of institutional cooperation in the state. The Legislature, therefore, decided not to consider any new bills until a plan could be devised to insure all qualified students an adequate educational opportunity with a minimum tax burden. The result was a state master plan for higher education to provide for the expansion, development, and integration, not only of facilities, but also of curriculum and standards in all institutions of higher education.[3]

State Planning with or without State Control

The concept of locally-controlled institutions has long dominated the literature and educational thought in the junior college field. According to junior college expert James Wattenbarger, "This local orientation has been the strongest element in the 'mystique' of the community junior college development."[4]

In spite of tradition, however, and in spite of numerous studies overwhelmingly favorable to local control and operation of junior colleges, there is a trend toward state operation and support. Wattenbarger states it is unlikely that the trend toward state control can be reversed. He urged that the positive results attributable to local operation be clearly identified so that ways can be found to preserve them. There must be, he insisted, "a clear delineation between state and local responsibilities."[5]

In the March 1968 issue of the *Junior College Journal*, Clifford Erickson endorsed the concept of simultaneous state planning and local control of public junior colleges. The success of such a system requires a creative balance between state coordination and planning and local autonomy and control.[6]

Erickson pointed to the trend toward state planning for higher education, relating it to the following factors:

1. Inadequate local planning to meet the needs of higher education.

2. Rapid emergence of the community college as an integral part of higher education.

3. Recognition of state responsibility for sharing in the financing of community colleges.

4. Expansion of federal funding with attendant state responsibilities.

5. Awareness of educational planning, both state and regional, as a part of public policy.

6. Experience in several states where master plans for higher education have been developed which assign a unique and important role to the community college.[7]

California and Florida are examples of states operating under state master plans with considerable state coordination, but with strong predilections toward local operation. Basil Clark has expressed the belief that local governing boards and institutions should retain the authority for developing new

programs or making program changes. But at the same time, he has called attention to the need for quality controls and coordination among educational institutions at the state level.[8]

Who Is Involved in State Planning?

Many groups are influential in the state planning of community colleges. These groups include official educational agencies, state committees or councils, appointed or contracted survey teams, groups characterized by their members' outside interests, and individuals.

In some states the legislative body has stimulated, or even mandated, a statewide study and plan. In others a master plan may start with a governor, a state superintendent, or a regent. It often involves a separate study group and, in many cases, looks to the initiative and drive of one or more vigorous, influential leaders.

What Does State Planning Include?

All state planning groups are concerned with population growth and higher education enrollments, capital outlay for developing institutions, and budgeting priorities.

They are concerned with the relationships among various institutions comprising a system of higher education. These include the control, administration, and scope of services of higher education generally, or of community colleges in particular. Planning groups must know if these services are available to all segments of the population.

State planning groups become concerned with problems of academic transfer, scholarships, curriculum adequacy, needed amendments to the laws, intercollegiate athletics, fraternities, degree requirements, federal funds, and even the approval of staff.

Rationale for State Master Planning

The ultimate goal of master planning is to assure that every citizen has the opportunity to receive the education for which he has the capacity. This would include all levels of education whether vocational-technical, general academic, or college transfer.

Perhaps the rationale for developing a state master plan can best be demonstrated by its following major purposes:

1. *The state master plan expresses the state's concern for the educational welfare of its adolescent and adult citizens.*

A plan will stress the importance of education to the state, to industrial strength, or to the individual. It may include an expression of belief in low tuition or no tuition, in scholarships, or in the proximity of institutions to the populations to be served.

2. *The state master plan should describe the integration of institutions into an organized system of higher education.*

Such a description will indicate the relationships among the institutions that together provide the educational opportunities incorporated in the plan. In a well-conceived master plan, different functions of the educational institutions can be planned, assigned, and justified. But the plan must enable individual facilities and programs to be responsive to diverse educational needs.

The federal government is playing an increasing role in higher education; hence, the state's use of federal assistance in its state and local fiscal effort should be a part of the master plan.

3. *A state plan is an effective way to describe a minimum foundation program.*

A state plan may describe those aspects of the curricula that are universally required as a foundation of the educational program. Or the minimum foundation program may describe only the financial structure. Any state plan is likely to delineate minimum program standards and degree requirements.

4. *A state plan can assist communities to assess their own capabilities and readiness to develop a college.*

Without the initiative of local communities, many community colleges would never have come into existence. However, a state plan describing minimum educational requirements can assist developing colleges to make an adequate start. A well-conceived state master plan shows communities how to measure available assets with those needed to organize and sustain a community college. Such a plan provides a broader-than-local perspective for understanding the state's educational needs.

5. *A master plan provides a means of removing community*

college establishment and development from purely political considerations and local pressures.

A well-defined master plan for community college development is more influential in the legislature than individual community plans and pressures.

A master plan provides the basis for making a unified request for financial support to the legislature, not only for the establishment of community colleges, but also for their expansion and development. In this way, planning for orderly growth and development of community colleges can prevent waste of state funds and inequities in educational opportunity in the state.

6. *An adequate master plan must remain flexible to provide a basis for further planning.*

Master plans are not static. Educational needs change, unexpected problems arise, experiments succeed or fail, even resources fluctuate. Although they are not static, master plans can assess progress toward established, long-range goals.

7. *The development of a state plan opens areas of needed research.*

State planning requires research in such areas as: economic impact of education; population projections; mobility studies; and manpower availability. Data from these research efforts are useful in making state-to-state comparisons which aid the planning process.

8. *The development of a master plan encourages and facilitates systematizing routine state services.*

Financial accounting is usually the first service to be systematized. With a master plan, other routine services can become more efficient. One example might be common scholarship and tuition plans for all levels of higher education.

9. *A master plan is an effective public relations instrument.*

Ultimately it is the layman who must know about community colleges if he is to vote the taxes to build and sustain them. Therefore, good sense dictates that the state master plan be an effective communications vehicle. It should build the citizen's confidence in the effectiveness and efficiency of the educational plans described.

One outstanding benefit of state planning is the bringing together of the layman and professional educator in a common endeavor.

- F O O T N O T E S -

[1]Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. "AAJC Approach: Faculty Development Project." *Junior College Journal*, 38:7; April, 1968.

[2]Allan S. Hurlburt. *State Master Planning for Two-Year Colleges*. (To be published by the American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.)

[3]F. D. Gurll. "The Development of a Master Plan for Higher Education in California." *College and University*, 41:269-279; Spring, 1966.

[4]James L. Wattenbarger. "Changing Patterns of Control: Local to State." *Junior College Journal*, 38:9-11; May, 1968, p. 9.

[5]*Ibid*, p. 11

[6]Clifford G. Erickson. "Illinois Balances Statewide Planning and Local Autonomy." *Junior College Journal*, 38: 22-26; March, 1968. p. 23.

[7]*Ibid.*, p. 23.

[8]Basil Clark. "Boards of Control in California." *Selected Papers* from the 44th Annual Convention, American Association of Junior Colleges, March 30-April 2, 1964, Bal Harbour, Florida. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964. pp. 28-34.

ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

ALASKA

Don M. Dafoe
Provost
University of Alaska
Anchorage, Alaska

Robert McFarland
Regent
University of Alaska
College, Alaska

Mrs. Edward C. Sweeney
Juneau
Alaska

William Wood
President
University of Alaska
College, Alaska

ARIZONA

* John T. Condon
Executive Director
Phoenix, Arizona

* Louis J. Felix
Chairman, State Board
Tucson, Arizona

* Joseph P. Ralston
Board Member
Phoenix, Arizona

* Richard Schuman
Board Member
Yuma, Arizona

* George Spikes
Board Member
Douglas, Arizona

CALIFORNIA

Sidney W. Brossman, Chancellor
Sacramento, California

William A. Dillard
Board Member
Brawley, California

James C. Dodd, Board Member
Sacramento, California

John W. Dunn
District Superintendent
Peralta Junior College Dist.
Oakland, California

Harmon K. Howard, Board Member
Walnut Creek, California

Joan H. King
Vice Chairman, Bd. of Governors
Los Angeles, California

Winifred H. Lancaster
Board Member
Santa Barbara, California

Carol W. Marsden, Board Member
San Marino, California

Charles W. Brydon
Assistant Executive Director
California Junior College Assn.
Sacramento, California

Krist Lane, Director of
Governmental Affairs
Sacramento, California

Archie McPherran
Executive Aid to State Board
State Dept. of Education
Sacramento, California

* *Arizona State Board of Directors for Community Colleges*

Board of Governors for California Community Colleges

CALIFORNIA, Continued

Lloyd E. Messersmith
Executive Director
California Junior College Assn.
Sacramento, California

Bernard C. Plover, Board Member
Santa Rosa, California

Charles R. Smoot, Board Member
Balboa, California

Myrtle Wiens, Board Member
Porterville, California

Harold F. Wolters, Chairman
Board of Governors
Nevada City, California

John Petersen, Center for Research & Development in Higher Education
University of California at Berkeley
Berkeley, California

Board of Governors for California Community Colleges

COLORADO

@ Lena Archuleta, Board Member
Denver, Colorado

@ Kieth Binford, Asst. Director for Planning & Research
Community College Division
Denver, Colorado

@ Stan Selby, Board Member
Colorado Springs, Colorado

@ Tom W. Ten Eyck, Board Member
Denver, Colorado

@ Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education

HAWAII

Robert Cushing
Chairman, Board of Regents
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

John Farias, Jr.
Regent
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Fred Haehnlen, Jr., Director
Division of Student Services
College of Education
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Richard H. Kosaki
Vice President for Community Colleges
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Herbert M. Richards, Jr.
Regent, Univ. of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

IDAHO

Don E. Keith
Executive Director for Higher Education
State Board of Education
Boise, Idaho

Joseph D. McCollum
Regent
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho

John J. Peacock
Regent
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho

Eldon Smith
President
State Board of Education
Rexburg, Idaho

MONTANA

Marjorie W. King
Regent
Montana University System
Winnett, Montana

NEVADA

Fred M. Anderson, M.D.
Regent
University of Nevada
Reno, Nevada

Robert Best
Governor's Commission on
Junior Colleges
Nevada State Capitol
Carson City, Nevada

Jerry Dondero
Carson City, Nevada

N. Edd Miller
President
University of Nevada
Reno, Nevada

Ed Pine, Chairman, Washoe
School District Board
Reno, Nevada

Albert Seelinger
Carson City, Nevada

Raymond L. Sturm
Clark County School District
Las Vegas, Nevada

Thomas T. Tucker
University of Nevada
Reno, Nevada

Robert Whelan, Clark
County School District
Las Vegas, Nevada

Juanita Greer White, Regent
University of Nevada
Boulder City, Nevada

NEW MEXICO

Bernard Baca
Superintendent
Los Lunas Consolidated Schools
Los Lunas, New Mexico

% James Crouch
Board Member
Las Cruces, New Mexico

% William McConnell
Executive Director
State Capitol
Santa Fe, New Mexico

% Kenneth Vinall
Board Member
Tucumcari, New Mexico

% Board of Educational Finance

OREGON

Eugene H. Fisher
Oakland, Oregon

William Loomis, Assistant
Superintendent
Community Colleges & Vocation-
al Education Division
Salem, Oregon

Jesse V. Fasold
Deputy Superintendent
State of Oregon Dept. of
Education
Salem, Oregon

UTAH

Merle Allen, Director
Coordinating Council of
Higher Education
Salt Lake City, Utah

Jay Campbell
Deputy Superintendent
Utah State Board of Education
Salt Lake City, Utah

UTAH, Continued

Kent Fielding
Coordinating Council of
Higher Education
Salt Lake City, Utah

Floyd S. Holm, President
Snow College
Ephraim, Utah

Reed Morrill, Member
State Board of Education
Salt Lake City, Utah

Dorothy Watkiss, Member
Coordinating Council of
Higher Education
Salt Lake City, Utah

WASHINGTON

+ Albert Canfield, Director
Olympia, Washington

The Honorable Gordon Sandison
State Senator
Port Angeles, Washington

+ Ruth Shepherd, Vice Chairman
of the Board
Pasco, Washington

+ Wash. St. Bd. for Community College Education

WYOMING

Don Hall
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming

OUT OF REGION

Dorothy Knoell, Director
Urban Community College Proj.
Amer. Assn. of Junior Colleges
Washington, D.C.

Ken Hansen
Education Commission of the States
Denver, Colorado

CONSULTANTS

Paul Elsner, Director
Division of Community Colleges
Colorado State Bd. for Community Coll. & Occupational Ed.
Denver, Colorado

Frederick Giles
Professor of Higher Education
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

Leland Medsker, Director
Center for Research & Development in Higher Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

John E. Roueche, Director
Community College Div. of the
Regional Laboratory for the
Carolinas and Virginia
Durham, North Carolina

Thomas Shay, Director
Community College Leadership
Program
Asso. Professor-Higher Education
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Dale Tillery
Center for Research & Development in Higher Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

WICHE STAFF

Kevin P. Bunnell
Associate Director for
General Regional Programs

Robert H. Kroepsch
Executive Director

W. John Minter
Director, Special Programs in
Higher Education

Julia Vadala
Staff Assistant

38:1M:369:WICHE:PP:1D